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Abstract
The paper deals with the areal-typological profiling of Ukrainian among languages of Europe, constituting Standard Average European (SAE) and especially Central European (CE). Placed recently in the context of the ‘areal typology’ and the ‘dynamic taxonomy’, Ukrainian together with Russian and Belarusian appear to be mere replica languages. Such languages are capable of only borrowing surface structures migrating all over the Europe uni or imitating deep structures on the model of SAE or CE.

In order to elaborate on an alternative profiling of Ukrainian among languages of (Central) Europe, the author concentrates on both phonological and morphosyntactic features treated commonly as CE Sprachbund-forming (the spirantization of *g, the dispalatalization of the palatalized consonants, the existence of medial l, the umlauting, the three-tense system, including a simple preterit from the perfect, and the periphrastic ‘ingressive’ future). As a result, the author advances another vector of areal classification, thus positioning Russian in the core of ‘Standard Average Indo-European’ and (Southwest) Ukrainian as an intermediate language between Russian and the rest of (Central) European languages.
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1. Introduction

In comparative and typological studies, Ukrainian has been routinely treated as a transitional language from East Slavic (cf. Jakobson, 1929; Stadnik, 2001:94) to North Slavic (Mrázek, 1990:28-30; Besters-Dilger, 2000), West Slavic (Lehfeldt, 1972:333-336) or even South Slavic (Smal-Stockyj and Gartner, 1913). In this paper I will pursue the peculiar status of Ukrainian viewed in the context of languages of Europe, especially those belonging to a Central European linguistic area, called a Danubian (Décsy 1973:87-104), Central European (CE) (Skalička, 1968; Kurzová, 1996a, 1996b) or a
Carpathian Sprachbund (Thomas, 2008).\(^1\) I will discuss first methodological problems related to the placement of languages in Europe as a linguistic area (sections 3 and 4). I will then dwell upon salient (Sprachbund-forming) properties of CE languages, as discussed in recent literature, in comparison with Ukrainian as a member of North and especially East Slavic (sections 5-5.3). All this will allow me to apply the so-called ‘historicist’ approach (Campbell, 2006:14) to those linguistic factors that can be held responsible for the structural affinities of the languages spoken in Central Europe, including Ukrainian, which is assigned in modern areal studies to a linguistic periphery of Europe. I will ultimately challenge the areal hierarchy of languages in Europe, in particular in its CE area. I will offer instead a classification with an opposite areal orientation, where (Southwest) Ukrainian holds an intermediate place between the core ‘Standard Average Indo-European’ (SAIE) features as found primarily in Russian, on the one side, and CE and, by extension, SAE languages, on the other (section 5.2).

2. Positioning Ukrainian in the ‘backyard’ of SAE?

Serious problems arise once Ukrainian is placed in the areal classification of languages of Europe which, although belonging to several families, have become increasingly alike due to cultural, social, economic, and political exchange across national boundaries (Heine and Kuteva, 2006:1). These families are Indo-European (IE) (Romance, Germanic, Celtic, Slavic, Baltic, Greek, Albanian, Indo-Aryan represented by Romani), the most numerous one, Finno-Ugric (Finnic, Samoyed and Ugric, represented by Hungarian), Altaic (Turkic), Caucasian, and Afroasiatic represented by the Maltese language, and finally a lone player, Basque (van der Auwera, 1998:6; cf. Dahl, 2001).

Given such diversity, it looks problematic to bring together the whole variety of languages of different stocks attested in Europe. Neither is it easy to ascertain common features that can help us delineate Europe as a linguistic area. This may be the reason why Europe as a linguistic area, consisting of languages sharing structural features as a result of contact (Thomason,
tends to be divided into several linguistic groupings such as the SAE area, the Balkan Sprachbund, the Circum-Baltic area, the Middle-Volga region (cf. Johanson, 2000), the Circum-Mediterranean area (Lewy, 1942; Décsy, 1973:60-68; Haarmann, 1976), and finally the CE Sprachbund (Kurzová, 1996a, 1996b; Newerkla 2002; Thomas 2008). The latter grouping was first outlined by Décsy (1973) but, remarkably, was not mentioned in the latest study of languages of Europe by Heine and Kuteva (2006). What is evidenced in all the aforementioned groupings is an obvious bias in favor of the Western European languages (Heine and Kuteva, 2006, 9, fn 5), which becomes even more pronounced in the treatment of SAE languages (cf. Dahl, 1990:3).

While regarding SAE as the European of Western Europe, van der Auwera (1998:817) suggested, and rightly so, that SAE should more appropriately be dubbed ‘Standard Average Western European’ (SAWE) (cf. Haspelmath, 2001:1505, Heine and Kuteva, 2006:27). Agreeing that the term SAWE is not perfect, van der Auwera (1998:824) advanced a theory of a ‘Charlemagne Sprachbund’ appropriating the name of the first ruler of an area where French, Italian, German and Dutch are today the core languages, and Polish as the only representative of the Slavic branch is found very close to the center of this convergence area.2

What is commonplace about all of the proposed European linguistic groupings is the peripheral status of East Slavic, in particular of Ukrainian,3 which along with Polish, Czech, Slovak, Upper and Lower Sorbian belong to one genetic stock called North Slavic (Mareš 1980:36).4 It is surprising then to

2 Positing language contact as a driving force behind structural affinities among these languages, van der Auwera (1998:824-825) pinned down three socio-historical factors allowing for their grouping: (1) the fact that France originated as a Frankish (Germanic) kingdom supports the ‘superstrate’ theory traditionally invoked to explain the special status of French, (2) the influence of the Catholic Church, (3) the colonizing and merchandizing eastward expansion of German into Slavic territory. Extralinguistic at their core, these factors, however, fail to explain the linguistic vehicle proper of contact-induced changes encompassing the adjacent languages.

3 A rare exception in this respect is Décsy (1973, 29-30) who identified Russian, from all the Eastern Slavic languages, as a member of the SAE linguistic area.

4 This group is, in fact, more complicated. In revising the traditional dichotomic and tripartite classifications, Kopečný (1949:4), for instance, proposed to divide all the Slavic languages into six groups: (1) Upper and Lower Sorbian, (2) Czech-Slovak, (3) Polish, (4) Macedonian-Bulgarian, (5) South Slavic, (6) East Slavic; along with Polish, the latter group is called by this author North Slavic. Mareš (1980:36) elaborated, instead, on a quaternary classification, premised largely on phonological and morphological features: (1) Southeast Slavic: Bulgarian and Macedonian, (2) Southwest Slavic: Serbian-Croatian, Slovene, (3) Northwest Slavic: Czech, Slovak, Upper and Lower Sorbian, Polish, (4) Northeast Slavic: Belarusian, Russian, Ukrainian. Leaving aside discussion of the classificatory characteristics, in this type of genetic grouping East Slavic is always paired with Polish, thereby potentially being linked to Czech and Slovak.
find Czech (although not Slovak) and Slovene in the core and Ukrainian together with the rest of the Eastern Slavic languages in the periphery of SAE delimited in Haspelmath (1998:273) with the help of twelve salient properties. The explanation of this ‘circumstantialist’ classification in Heine and Kuteva (2006:35) leaves much to be desired (cf. Campbell, 2006:14). The authors state correctly that the linguistic map of Europe has been shaped significantly by language contact of various kinds and in various periods within the course of the last two millennia. But it is not convincing why clustering of linguistic properties is particularly pronounced in most of all Romance and Germanic languages which, as Greek and Latin in the past, serve purportedly as models of transfer, even if this may be due to some extent to the fact that “we know much more about these languages than the languages of Eastern Europe” (Heine and Kuteva, 2006:35), especially about less researched Ukrainian and Belarusian.

In sum, the abovementioned ‘circumstantialist’ approach is biased in favor of the languages of Europe’s western half (Heine and Kuteva, 2006:26) and, as I will show, is likely to collapse once challenged genetically and typologically.

3. Positioning Ukrainian at the threshold of CE?

A linguistic clustering capable of accommodating languages, placed at the opposite sides of Europe, is offered in the theory of a CE Sprachbund. Since Lewy (1942) scholarly tradition has taken for granted that the cultures and languages of Central Europe constitute a specific contact areal where participating languages demonstrate a number of convergent features. However, to determine both participating languages and convergent features has proved difficult, although unlike SAE the pool of potential players, belonging to Germanic, Slavic, and Finno-Ugric is much smaller.

From among the languages cited above, Hungarian, Czech and Slovak seem to constitute the core of the CE grouping. The only exception is found in Lewy (1942:48) who opposed Czech and Slovak, characterized by stem-based inflexion (Cz slov-a nom - slov-a gen ‘word’, hlav-a nom. - hlav-y gen ‘head’), to German and Hungarian as center languages with word-based inflexion (G Wort nom - Wort-es gen ‘word’, Kopf nom - Kopf-es gen ‘head’), thus excluding Slavic from the CE linguistic area. Kurzová (1996b:58-59) argued that this exclusion was not well-grounded since it undermined the areal foundation of German serving as a linking chain between, on the one hand, the analytic SAE languages and, on the other, the synthetic (stem-inflecting) Slavic languages.
As is evidenced in Table 1, Thomas (2008) radically increased the number of CE languages. According to him, Central Europe is too vast an area to be considered a unified contact zone. This is why he offered a two-tier classification which consists of two groupings. The first comprises the languages spoken within the former Habsburg Empire: Czech, Slovak, Serbian-Croatian, Hungarian, German, Polish, Ukrainian together with Rusyn treated by the author as a separate East Slavic language,5 Italian, and Romanian, to which two migratory languages, Yiddish and Romani, might be added. Yet, a more manageable group of languages, he argued, can be defined by taking the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Linguistic area</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novák (1939/1940)</td>
<td>Central European</td>
<td>German, Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewy (1942)</td>
<td>Central European</td>
<td>German, Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skalička (1968)</td>
<td>Central European</td>
<td>German, Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Serbian-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Décsy (1973)</td>
<td>Danubian</td>
<td>Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Serbian-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haarmann (1976)</td>
<td>Danubian</td>
<td>German, Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Serbian-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurzová (1996a),</td>
<td>Central European</td>
<td>German, Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newerkla (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas (2008)</td>
<td>Central European, Danubian/Carpathian</td>
<td>German, Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Serbian-Croatian, Polish, Ukrainian, Rusyn, Italian, Romanian, Romani, Yiddish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 A stance not ubiquitously accepted by Slavists, Thomas (2008:126) claims that Rusyn is a separate East Slavic language spoken on both sides of the Carpathians in Eastern Slovakia, Ukraine and in Vojvodina. However, Rusyn has always been an intrinsic part of the mainstream all-Ukrainian literary and language tradition (Danylenko, 2009). Apart from the local variety spoken in Vojvodina, Rusyn as postulated by Thomas is rather an ‘imagined product’, dissociated with the linguistic reality as reflected, to name a few most reliable sources, in the dialectal Atlas of the Ukrainian Language (Matvijas et al., 1984-2001) and The Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language of Shevelov (1979). In other words, what Thomas takes to be a separate East Slavic language, is in fact a group of Western Ukrainian (e.g., Transcarpathian) rural dialects used historically in combination with Church Slavonic and loan elements from Russian, Slovak, and Polish.
Interestingly, the Carpathian linguistic area consisting of local Romance languages, Hungarian and Northern Slavic languages have been already discussed by some Eastern Slavic scholars (Rot, 1967; Bernštejn, 1972). Based on *The Carpathian Dialectological Atlas*, they further postulated the existence of a Carpathian-Balkan Sprachbund where the Carpathian members constituted its periphery (Bernštejn, 1972:13). Among the Carpathian-Balkan convergences, Nimčuk (1993:48-49, 51-54) identified the following morphosyntactic ‘primary properties’: the enclitic use of the dative possessive pronoun, analytic adjectival comparative forms, a supersessive marker for numerals between ‘11’ and ‘19’, a periphrastic de-volitive future with a *want*-auxiliary. Interestingly enough, the author traced the corresponding Transcarpathian Ukrainian features to the Common Slavic period, hence a residual use of the de-volitive future with the auxiliary *xoroty* ‘to want’ in Southeast Ukrainian. For some cases he did not exclude a mutual reinforcement by languages genetically and typologically distant such as Ukrainian and Hungarian. The abovementioned numerals might be supported by parallel forms in Hungarian and Romanian.

Habsburg boundaries before 1772, i.e., before the acquisition of Galicia, Bukovyna, Bosnia and Dalmatia (Thomas, 2008:125). This group, consisting of Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Serbian/Croatian, German, and Hungarian, is delineated by geographical features: to the north, the ring of the Carpathian Mountains extending from the Bavarian Forest through the Sudeten, the Tatras to the Transylvanian Alps; to the south, the Julian Alps and the Dinaric Range; and in the west, the Tauern and Dolomites of the Alpine Range. Since the area bordered by these mountain ranges and drained by the middle course of the Danube is the Carpathian Basin, Thomas (2008:126) suggested we call this contact zone Carpathian or Danubian.6

The proposed classification raises several questions. One of them concerns the parameters offered by Thomas to define the CE Sprachbund. In his approach, preference is given to the extralinguistic (political and geographical) features rather than to the linguistic properties of the languages which are likely to constitute a convergence CE area. Trying first to ascertain a group of languages and only then drawing up an inventory of possible regionalisms, the author intended to satisfy some rather general conditions, which are, to list a few: (1) convergence must involve more than two languages, (2) language contact between these languages has been over a long period, (3) features common to these languages must not be based on a genetic relationship, (4) every language retains its membership in a language family (no piginization), (5) there must be structural parallels on the morphosyntactic level, (6) language contact has produced a complex interplay of substrat, superstrat and adstrat influences, (7) influences must be multi- not uni-directional (Thomas, 2008:124-125).

However, these conditions are minimally diagnostic of the languages constituting the so-called Carpathian Sprachbund. In fact, they can hardly help

---

6 Interestingly, the Carpathian linguistic area consisting of local Romance languages, Hungarian and Northern Slavic languages have been already discussed by some Eastern Slavic scholars (Rot, 1967; Bernštejn, 1972). Based on *The Carpathian Dialectological Atlas*, they further postulated the existence of a Carpathian-Balkan Sprachbund where the Carpathian members constituted its periphery (Bernštejn, 1972:13). Among the Carpathian-Balkan convergences, Nimčuk (1993:48-49, 51-54) identified the following morphosyntactic ‘primary properties’: the enclitic use of the dative possessive pronoun, analytic adjectival comparative forms, a supersessive marker for numerals between ‘11’ and ‘19’, a periphrastic de-volitive future with a *want*-auxiliary. Interestingly enough, the author traced the corresponding Transcarpathian Ukrainian features to the Common Slavic period, hence a residual use of the de-volitive future with the auxiliary *xoroty* ‘to want’ in Southeast Ukrainian. For some cases he did not exclude a mutual reinforcement by languages genetically and typologically distant such as Ukrainian and Hungarian. The abovementioned numerals might be supported by parallel forms in Hungarian and Romanian.
delineate the boundaries of the Carpathian Sprachbund outlined by Thomas, based on the boundaries of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire. Remarkably, the two-tier classification of languages is linked by the author to the 1772 partition of Poland, although much more important event was the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867 which triggered changes in the linguistic interrelations of the local (Transcarpathian) Ukrainian (Rusyn) vernacular with Hungarian and German. Long before this year, in order to resist Magyar assimilation the local Rusyn population had been resorting to Russian, an unexpected player in the CE area. Hence the emergence in both parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire of a particular Russian-Ukrainian hybrid, jazyče, which depending on a locality contained (Russian) Church Slavonicisms, Polish, Hungarian, and German admixtures.

In short, Thomas advances political and geographical parameters for the linguistic generalization whose validity he proposes to test post factum. Interestingly, while projecting extralinguistic parameters onto the linguistic space, Thomas eliminates some ‘redundant’ speech (dialectal) communities which do not fit into the ‘imperial borders’ of the CE ‘Habsburg Sprachbund’. Thus, Czech, Slovak, and Hungarian seem to entirely satisfy the abovementioned political and geographical parameters (Thomas, 2008:125), while the rest of the languages are limited to one or more dialects as, for instance, Kajkavian and Štokavian spoken in Slovenia for Croatian and spoken in Vojvodina for Serbian.

Strangely, despite the long history of political, cultural, and linguistic contacts of Ukrainian with Polish, German and other CE languages and dialects (Bednarczuk, 1993; Danylenko, 2011a), no Ukrainian dialects fully qualify to belong to their ‘managable group’ of CE, according to Thomas (2008:125). In order to elaborate both areal and typological profiling of Ukrainian, I will analyze in sections 4-5.3 only those Ukrainian features which are found among the CE Sprachbund-forming properties (e.g., Skála, 2000; Thomas, 2008). As has been already suggested, this will allow me to ascertain the status of Ukrainian in its relation to CE and, ultimately, change the areal orientation of the classification of languages of (Central) Europe, with Ukrainian holding an intermediate position in this area (section 5.2).

4. Phonological features

Leaving aside the prosodic features of phonemic pitch, initial stress, and quantity opposition in vowels, which are attested both in and outside the CE
linguistic area, I will offer in sections 4.1-4.4 a brief survey of its CE-salient phonological features, which are the spirantization of \(*g\), the dispalatalization of the palatalized consonants, the existence of medial \(l\), and the umlauting (delabialization of the rounded vowels) (Novák, 1939/1940; Skála 2000; Thomas 2008:132-134).

4.1. Spirantization of \(*g\)

There are solid grounds for challenging the theory of contact-induced spiran-
tization of \(*g > \gamma (> h)\) in Ukrainian (and Belarusian) under the influence of CE. Novák (1939/1940) hypothesized that this sound change might have run to completion in these lands in the 14th-15th centuries under the influence of Czech. Yet the whole process, according to this author, was initially triggered within the CE Sprachbund by German in the 12th-13th centuries and ultimately transferred by Polish into East Slavic as used in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (cf. Danylenko, 2011a:170-171).

The absolute chronology, however, speaks for an internal, morphonological motivation of the aforesaid change (cf. Danylenko, 2005a). The spirantization of \(*g\) occurred in the late 12th or early 13th century in the entire Ukrainian territory, that is, after the loss of jers, although it is impossible today to establish the original center of its irradiation (Shevelov, 1979:355). The change \(*g > \gamma\) was shared with Belarusian and South Russian, but not with Czech and Slovak, where the spirantization fell into the time before the loss of jers, i.e., presumably in the 10th century. In fact, the presence of an uninterrupted belt \(\gamma / h\) from the Bavarian frontier to the Oka river which cuts through the entire Slavic territory, with \(g\)-languages both north (North Russian, Polish, Lower Sorbian) and south (Slovene, except some westernmost dialects, Serbian and Croatian, save some littoral dialects, Macedonian and Bulgarian) can
hardly be a result of convergence, involving German, Hungarian, Czech and Slovak within the CE Sprachbund.

The case of Ukrainian γ / h, which incidentally is not mentioned in Thomas (2008), but has been discussed by other authors (Newerkla, 2002:214-215; Skála, 2000:79) as a CE Sprachbund diagnostic feature of Czech and German, is internally motivated. The appearance of this sound should be connected with the retention of Common Slavic protensity (tenseness) in the Ukrainian dialects. In Common Slavic the protensity opposition brought about deitiation and a series of lenitions of Proto-Slavic *g which in Ukrainian was further modified to a pharyngeal h. The failure to lenite some reflexes of *g in the g-languages was due to the transition to a phonemic voicing system with neutralization before all obstruents (Andersen, 1969:555-569; Danylenko 2005a).

### 4.2. Dispatalatalization

Another CE Sprachbund-forming feature is a loss of the palatalization correlation and the dispatalatalization of consonants which allegedly aligned the phonological systems of CE with those of Hungarian and German (Thomas, 2008:132). To begin with, these changes encompass not only the CE languages but also most of the languages used in the Balkans. Moreover, the lack of palatalization before e (< *e, *о, *ę) and the y reflex of *i is observed in all the Southeastern, Northern, and more than half of the Southwestern Ukrainian dialects, thus demonstrating a series of spontaneous local developments attested from the 12th century onward (Žovtobrjux et al., 1979:218). As Shevelov (1979:551) assumed, this process was a rather sluggish one allowing for many partial preservations of palatalization, especially if there were morphological motivations for those. That might be the reason behind the inclusion of Ukrainian together with Belarusian and Russian into the Euro-Asiatic phonetic Sprachbund with accentual monotony and distinctive palatalization in consonants (Jakobson, 1938:55, cf. Stadnik, 2001). However, the process as described by Shevelov excludes any external causation from Polish as a member of the CE Sprachbund, where the correlation of palatalization developed differently (Stieber, 1973:31).

In view of the isolation of Ukrainian among the Slavic languages with overall palatalization of either labials and dentals (Russian, Belarusian, Polish, and East Bulgarian) or at least dentals or some of them (Slovak), one can come up with a different explanation. Accepting the lack of palatalization as an innovation in Ukrainian (and the CE linguistic area), one has to assume that in the late prehistoric time proto-Ukrainian (and some Western Slavic dialects) did palatalize consonants before front vowels only to give it up a couple of
centuries later, which seems unnecessarily complicated and even self-contradictory for Ukrainian (Shevelov, 1979:72). As an alternative scenario, Stadnik (2001:100) endorsed the theory of ‘non-palatalists’, while claiming that the lack of palatalization in the environment before e (< *e, *ь, *ę) and y (< *i) is no Ukrainian innovation but rather the retention of the older state of palatalization of labials and dentals. Thus, unlike the palatalizing neighboring languages, Ukrainian maintains the archaic (Common Slavic) level of non-phonemic palatalization of labials and dentals. What is innovative in the introduction of palatalization is the tendency in modern Ukrainian to palatalize consonants before i of any origin, from e (before a syllable withь) as in sim < semь ‘seven’ from the 13th century or even from o as in sil’ < solь ‘salt’, a change which took place in the 17th century (Shevelov, 1979:175).

The theory of the ‘lack of palatalization’ in Ukrainian allows for an independent historical dispalatalization in the CE languages which, as we believe, have kept their phonological systems aligned not so much with those of Hungarian and German as with the prehistorical situation in Common Slavic.

4.3. Medial l

In conjunction with the loss of the palatalization correlation, Thomas (2008:132-133) mentioned medial l, a lateral phoneme in German, Yiddish and Hungarian, as well as in the languages of Western Europe. In the case of Czech-Slovak continuum, Slovak preserves the distinction between palatalized and non-palatalized l, except its southwestern dialects (Krajčovič, 1975:117). Having lost, however, the opposition of palatalization, Czech has introduced a new medial phoneme and joined, together with some Slovene dialects (Greenberg, 2000:140), the abovementioned non-Slavic languages. There are therefore good grounds, according to Thomas (2008:131), to treat the medial l as a CE feature.

The medial (‘Central European’) l is found in some places in Podolia, the Bojkian and Lemkian regions and Transcarpathia (Shevelov, 1979:745), which potentially may link Ukrainian with the CE linguistic area or even the Balkans (Nimčuk, 1993:50). The precise distribution of this sound is not known, although it is attested both in East Ukrainian (Poltava and Starobil’s’k dialects) and West Ukrainian (Bukovyna and Pokuttja) (Zovtobrjux et al., 1979:318-319; Żylko, 1966:64), especially in those Southwestern Ukrainian dialects which contact with Hungarian and Romanian (Pan’kevyč, 1938:55) but not with Polish whose phonological system is free from this sound (Stieber, 1973:110). In terms of the relative chronology, the medial l could hardly have arisen before the 17th century, the time of the final formation of
Southeast Ukrainian and probably not later that the end of that century (Shevelov, 1979:745). In view of this well-established sound and its connection with the loss of palatalization across Ukrainian dialects, there are no grounds for considering medial / as a CE Sprachbund-forming feature (cf. Thomas, 2008:133). Moreover, this sound brings the languages of Central Europe into line with the languages of both Western and Eastern Europe.

4.4. Delabialization of rounded vowels

Thomas (2008:133-134) maintains that the so-called česká přehláska (delabialization of rounded vowels) of the type ā > e, ŏ > e, ŭ > i has been modeled on a similar process in the Bavarian and Silesian dialects of German (cf. Novák 1939/40:107-109; Berger 1999). Treating a similar fronting u > ŭ in the Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects of Croatian together with the eastern dialects of Slovene as independent, Thomas (2008:133-134) finds it difficult to see the delabialization of rounded vowels as a CE Sprachbund feature. However, the area of this phenomenon far exceeds the Carpathian Basin and it is restricted to Czech and some German dialects, thus dividing the languages of the Danube Basin.

Slavic, in particular Ukrainian material, casts doubts on the thesis about the česká přehláska as a newly-acquired feature influenced by German. Czech shifts of back vowels into front vowels, particularly in its 13th to 14th century transition of ŭ > i after palatalized consonants, e.g., l’ud > lid ’people’, had a direct precedent in Common Slavic where tentatively two waves of delabialization occurred. In terms of relative chronology, the nasal vowels arose after the first delabialization, while the second delabialization was concomitant to the third palatalization operating in full swing in proto-Czech, proto-Macedonian, and proto-Bulgarian (Shevelov, 1964:328, 349). The delabialization was important in that it extended the principle of intrasyllabic harmony to the next syllable as a whole. It is not therefore surprising to find parallel alternations ā > e and ŭ > i in some Bulgarian dialects, e.g., čāša but čēši ’bowls’, klĭč from klŭč ’key’ (Shevelov, 1964: 602, Koneski, 1983:12-13, 40), which do not belong to the CE grouping.

Rooted in Late Common Slavic, similar cases of ā > e and ŭ > i, encompassed a large strip of the Ukrainian territory in the 15th to 16th centuries; although isolated, they are also attested in Southeast Ukrainian (Shevelov, 1979:541-548, 598-603), which is not included in the CE linguistic area.
5. Morphosyntactic features

The morphosyntactic features identified as Sprachbund-forming are of paramount importance for our discussion. First, they are not numerous. Second, as ‘Central Europeanisms’ they look highly dubious. Thomas (2008:134-141) cites six ‘credible’ Sprachbund-forming features in total: (1) three-tense system, (2) perfect as a sole preterit, (3) periphrastic future, (4) pluperfect (5), prepositive definite article, and (6) prepositive indefinite article. The first three may be treated as ‘true’ Central Europeanisms, being also found among ten features singled out by Kurzová (1996b:61) which are the following: (1) word-based inflexion, (2) analytic adjectival and adverbial comparative forms, (3) three-tense system without semantic opposition within the preterital system of the indicative, (4) periphrastic ‘ingressive’ future, (5) periphrastic passive, (6) sentences with the SVO order, (7) a limited use of gerunds, (8) a system of subordinate clauses with the corresponding conjunctions, (9) relative clauses with former interrogative pronoun used as conjunctions, (10) the use of proverbs (cf. Newerkla, 2002:216).

I will look here into the most salient features only, i.e., the three-tense system, including a simple preterit derived from the perfect (section 5.2), and the periphrastic ‘ingressive’ future (section 5.3), preceded by a brief discussion of the CE nominative-accusative structure (section 5.1).

5.1. Nominative-accusative structure

Kurzová (1996b, 1999) tried to bring all the above mentioned features under one major morphosyntactic CE type. She proposed to distinguish between the typologically innovative Western European (SAE) languages and Northeast Slavic. According to Kurzová, the major difference between them lay in the generalization of the nominative-accusative structure as found in SAE. In the formalized sentence structure of the analytic Western European languages the finite verb is obligatory (as the copula in sentences with nominal predicate), functioning as a marker of sentencehood, whence the subject position is obligatorily filled in impersonal sentences by the dummy it, il, es and the like.

As Kurzová (1999:503-505) argued, German is a language ‘transmitting’ features of SAE to CE whose ‘focus’ Slavic languages, Czech and Slovak, differ from East Slavic and Polish in using sentences with other than finite predicates and other than main nominative-accusative actants. One of them is the dative experiencer in impersonal reflexive constructions:
Czech and Slovak, where the dative is restricted to individual impersonal phrases like mně (l-dat) se (refl) zdá (seem-3sg-pres) ‘it seems to me’, have been affected by the SAE generalization of the finite nominative-accusative sentence (Kurzová, 1999:504). This is why these languages lack other than finite predicates, including the indeclinable forms in -nol-to as found in Polish, some Northern and Northwestern Russian dialects, and Ukrainian (Danylenko, 2005b, 2006:243–262), and in some Lithuanian dialects where these forms are used either with the nominative or accusative direct object (cf. Danylenko, 2005c). The following example illustrates a Polish-Ukrainian isogloss of the impersonal construction with the accusative (or genitive) direct object and the form in -nol-to in the predicate:

(2) kozačen'ka (bulo) vbyto

Cossack-acc-sg-m be-aux-n-sg-pret kill-n-sg-PPP

‘The Cossack has been killed’.

The postulated generalization of the nominative-accusative structure in Czech and Slovak under the influence of SAE (Kurzová, 1996b:61) merits additional consideration.

To begin with, one finds a similar pattern in modern Czech, containing largely the genitive direct object (Havránek, 1937:89; Danylenko, 2006:256–258):

(3) Města bylo dobýto

city-gen-sg-n be-aux-n-sg-pret take-n-sg-PPP

‘The city has been taken.’

Called impersonal passive, this Czech construction is attested, however, less frequently than the reflexive one with a genitive direct object. In the vernacular it tends to be replaced by a personal passive construction with the neuter subject agreeing with the PPP in the predicate (Havránek and Jedlička, 1963:231, 330). At first blush, the fact that Modern Czech demonstrates a tendency to drop the impersonal passive from the morphosyntactic system proves Kurzová’s thesis about the Czech nominative-accusative structure replicated on a parallel SAE structure. Is it not the reason why Polish impersonal constructions are commonly translated into Czech with the help of the active predicate in 3rd person plural, the periphrastic passive, or simply the reflexive construction (Rytel-Kuc, 1990:128-135)?
I would rather claim that, to this end, the major emphasis should be placed on the origin of this impersonal construction rather than on its vitality in Modern Czech. The origin can be viewed from both prehistoric (a) and historic (b) perspectives.

(a) From a prehistoric perspective, the forms in -no/-to were primarily embedded in the IE nominal system and played, so far as they formed the so-called verbal adjectives, a significant role in the late IE individual languages (Meillet, 1924:351-354). Today, the use of non-canonical predicates in -no/-to within the modern nominative-accusative structure in North Slavic and residually in West and South Slavic is a realization of the IE tendency to incorporate, although to a different extent, the erstwhile nominal forms in their verbal systems. Thus, in using today the predicates in -no/-to, Ukrainian and some Belarusian and Russian dialects as well as Polish look 'more innovative', while the rest of the Slavic languages, including Czech, seem to lag behind in the elaboration of other than finite predicates. In this respect, one may mention here Meillet (1924:150-151, 63-64) who described Slavic languages as both most conservative and revolutionary. He believed that, having retained the 'archaic [IE] grammatical type', Slavic innovated on numerous forms, including those in -no/-to, shared today by many or all of the Slavic dialects.

(b) From a historic perspective, impersonal constructions with the predicates in -no/-to developed in Middle Czech at the time of its active contacts with German. Suffice to cite here a well-known example from the Hradecký manuscript (14th century), with the accusative case of direct object but without an auxiliary (Gebauer, 1929:13):

\[(4) \ldots prošeno mne i mého otce \text{(Middle Czech)}\]
\[
\text{invite-n-sg-PPP I-acc and my-acc-sg-m father-acc-sg-m}\
\]
\[\text{‘[\ldots] my father and I have been invited’.}\]

The accusative direct object in the impersonal construction with the predicate in -no/-to was well retained into the 19th century; it was found in the eastern dialects even later (Havránek, 1937, 89). Practically simultaneously, in the late 14th century, impersonal constructions of this type came to be attested in Ukrainian, Belarusian, and Polish, which allowed some scholars to posit the influence of the Polish impersonal constructions on both Czech (Koneczna, 1956) and Ukrainian together with Belarusian (Shevelov, 1969).

The contact-induced scenario, however, looks dubious. First of all, it is problematic to bring the development of the aforementioned Polish-Ukrainian
This isogloss into line with a possible existence of analogous constructions in Middle Russian and the emergence of new impersonal constructions with the predicate in -nol-to in North Russian in the 19th century (Danylenko, 2005b). One also wonders whether Belarusian, having dropped the impersonal construction with the -nol-to-predicate in the bulk of its dialects, qualifies nowadays to join the CE linguistic area affected by the SAE generalization of the finite nominative-accusative sentence. It is not either clear, why West Ukrainian, which has long coexisted with German within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, elaborated further on this impersonal construction? To use the logic of the advocates of CE, Polish and Ukrainian, which equally and evenly employ both finite and non-finite predicates within the nominative-accusative structure, can be treated then as CE Slavic languages.

Overall, the similarity of the finite nominative-accusative construction in Czech and North Slavic is not accidental. The source of the structural affinity is inheritance and independent development rather than accident or even diffusion (cf. Thomason, 2000:313).

5.2. Three-tense system and perfect as a single preterit

Since Skalička (1968:3) the three-tense system has been treated as a salient property of CE (Kurzová, 1996b:61; Thomas, 2008:134) despite the fact that a similar system is also found today in East Slavic, primarily Russian since some Ukrainian and Belarusian dialects are characterized by the residual use of pluperfect.

The abovementioned structural affinity between CE and East Slavic is not accidental. In the latter zone, the tense-aspect system underwent a considerable reduction in tense-aspect paradigms, from seven in Old East Slavic through five in the Middle period to three in primarily Russian as well as North and Southeast Ukrainian, some Belarusian dialects. The tense reduction in East Slavic can be seen as an elaboration and simplification of aspectual distinctions from the formation, among other oppositions, of imperfect vs. aorist through its loss to the regrammation (a change of grammatical content)

---

<UN> <UN> <UN>
of the perfective vs. imperfective category, a process which have run, as has been mentioned, practically to completion in modern Russian. Hence the regrammation of the perfect as preterit, much later followed by the *l*-form becoming finite and the loss of the auxiliary in Russian (Andersen, 2006a: 249-250, 251), while in Southwest Ukrainian the auxiliary is still used as a Wackernagel or verb-adjacent clitic (Danylenko, 2012: 10-13).

Thus, the development of the three-tense system in Slavic is a result of the prehistoric and historic elaboration-through-simplification of aspectual distinctions. The appearance of a similar system in Czech and Slovak should be viewed therefore through the prism of the abovementioned tendency, which, as has been argued, have run to completion in Russian and some other Eastern Slavic dialects, but not in Southwest Ukrainian. In other words, the three-tense system in Czech and Slovak together with the variety of German spoken in the Carpathian Basin, on the one hand, and a similar temporal system in Hungarian, on the other, show convergent features by accident. Since Hungarian belongs to the agglutinative type with its own temporal system (Skalička, 1968:4), the major problem lies in German, which employs two past tense forms, the periphrastic perfect (G *Perfekt*) and the preterit (G *Präteritum*). In order to secure the CE status of this language, Kurzová (1996b:63) surmised that the distribution of these tenses in German is fairly stylistic, a fact which transgresses the parameters of the historic elaboration of aspectual distinctions in Czech and Slovak and especially in East Slavic.

Granted that the reduction of tense forms in Slavic is a result of the elaboration-through-simplification of aspectual oppositions, it is worth recalling here a hypothesis of Gak (1997:50). The latter posited for IE “one developmental cline of the preterital system” which, while proceeding from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains, becomes ever simpler. According to Gak, having acquired a three-tense system, East Slavic, and especially Russian, finished this cline in full as compared with the analytic Western European languages (primarily Germanic and Romance) called today SAE. Having dropped prehistoric aspectual oppositions, SAE elaborated on tense paradigms, while Slavic reduced the number of aspectual distinctions down to the perfective vs. imperfective category, accompanied by a substantial simplification of tense forms.

To give a general idea of this change, the system of seven tense paradigms in Old East Slavic is indeed identical with that of eight tense paradigms in modern French (Gak, 1997:51; Andersen, 2006a:234-235, 2006b:11).

I venture to claim that East Slavic constitutes the core of, what can be labeled, ‘Standard Average IE’ (SAIE), with Russian serving as its focus language and (Southwest) Ukrainian holding the intermediate position between
SAIE and the neighboring European languages. In contrast to SAE, determined largely by the concept of areal diffusion, the notion of SAIE, remotely reminiscent of Lewy’s (1942:21) concept of ‘the Indo-Europeanization of Europe’, is conceived of both genetically and typologically. This accounts for the tense-aspect distinction(s) in the typologically innovative analytic Western European (primarily Germanic and Romance) languages as compared to the typologically ‘conservative’ synthetic (Eastern) Slavic languages.

I believe that this type of distinction is a defining property of the IE languages which predetermines the evolvement of other morphosyntactic and even phonological features (cf. Plank 1998; Mel’nikov 2003), in particular the formation of periphrastic future(s) (see section 5.3). Remarkably, the latter tense form shows the same morphosyntactic progression as found in the system of perfect tenses (Danylenko, 2012:7); note that different auxiliaries can be used in both prospect (periphrastic futures) and retrospection (perfect tenses).

5.3. Periphrastic Future

According to Kurzová (1996a:5-6, 1996b:64), the use of the periphrastic ingressive future is a salient property of CE. Her argumentation can be reduced to the following theses:

(1) Unlike most European languages whose futures are based on modal verbs with the meaning of wish or necessity, the future auxiliaries of CE languages are verbs with original ingressive meanings: H írni fogok, G ich werde schreiben, Cz budu psáti, Slk budem písati ‘I shall write’.

(2) The use of the periphrastic future is restricted in this linguistic area. Present forms like H megírom, G ich schribe (es), Cz napišu (1.sg) ‘I shall write’ are also used for expressing the future meaning. In the Slavic CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old East Slavic</th>
<th>Modern French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present</strong></td>
<td><strong>Présent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idu</td>
<td>je vais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perfect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Passé</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jesmb šdb</td>
<td>je suis allé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperfect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Imparfait</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idjaxb</td>
<td>j’allais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pluperfect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plus-que-parfait</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bjaxb šdb</td>
<td>j’étais allé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jesmb bylb šdb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aorist</strong></td>
<td><strong>Passé simple</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idb, idoxb</td>
<td>j’allai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong></td>
<td><strong>Passé antérieur</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budu/imul/cočju iti</td>
<td>je fus allé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future perfect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Futur antérieur</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budu šdb</td>
<td>je serai allé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
languages, the perfective present form is a grammaticalized expression of the future, while in German present-for-future is based on lexical distinctions (Kurzová, 1996a:15).

This theory is premised on the ‘circumstantialist’ (contact-induced) explanation of the historic development of the future tense in this area accepting either German or Czech as a center of its radiation. Dahl (2000:324; cf. Berger 2008:69) argued that the infinitive future, initially influenced by the German future with the auxiliary werden ‘to become’, might have spread from the Czech area at the end of the 13th century, showing up in Polish, Belarusian, and Ukrainian at the end of the 14th century and in Russian in the 15th century. Expanding potentially the limits of the CE linguistic area, this hypothesis reveals obvious chronological and areal discrepancies. Thus, as early as the 14th century, the German speakers had at their disposal, on the one hand, de-modal constructions with sollen ‘must’ and especially wollen ‘to want’, and, on the other hand, paraphrases with werden ‘to become’ in combination with present participles and infinitives, e.g., ich werde sehende or ich werde sehen ‘I shall see’, correspondingly (Křížková, 1960:86-87, 94, 99). Ultimately, constructions with the infinitive prevailed, although constructions with the present participle of the main verb, usually with the inceptive meaning, occurred in parallel use for a long period of time.

In Middle Czech there was no similar distribution. Combinations of the stem bud- with l-participle, a very rare construction at that time, had a special status in the tense system, being not related to the infinitive construction; combinations with the present active participle were also rare in Middle Czech. Moreover, the infinitive construction with werden, spreading from the northernmost of the High German dialects, shaped during the time span of 1375 to 1450, while a similar Middle Czech construction became the only future marker available for the imperfective use in the late 13th century. Serious doubts about the borrowing of this future were recently expressed by Andersen (2006b:28) who hypothesized that this future had been long established in some Russian dialects that just happened not to be attested, an assumption which holds true for Ukrainian where the corresponding future form became recorded relatively late (Danylenko, 2012:18-27).9

---

9 Leiß (1985) claimed that the east-to-west diffusion in German and the subsequent diffusion from West Slavic to Muscovy together point to Prague as the center of the irradiation of the infinitive future construction. Krämer (2005, 77-78) argued though that the abovementioned direction for German looks dubious. According to her, there are neither chronological nor dialectal grounds for substantiating the east-to-west diffusion under the influence of the corresponding Czech form. She questioned also the nature of the Czech-German bilingualism that purportedly could have initiated the spread of the Czech infinitive future.
The second counterargument concerns the future auxiliary in Hungarian, 
*fog* ‘to take’ which is different from the perfective auxiliary ‘to be’ (*LCS* *bɒd̪o*)
used either with the infinitive or the *l*-form (from the resultative participle) in
East, West (Slovak, Czech, Sorbian, Polish, Kashubian), and Western South
Slavic (Čakavian, Kajkavian, and Slovene) as well as the German auxiliary
*werden* ‘to become’. Accordingly, the corresponding Hungarian future can be
labeled ‘de-inceptive’ (ingressive) (Andersen, 2006b:33).

A complete de-inceptive analogue of the Hungarian future is the Ukrainian
synthetic or ‘inflectional’ future like *pysaty-mu* (to write-1sg-fut.) (Danylenko,
2012:23-26). This future, attested largely in North and Southeast (Modern)
Ukrainian, originated from a paraphrase with the inceptive phasal verb *jati* ‘to
take’ grammatized subsequently as an auxiliary different from the de-modal
extension of *imati* ‘to have’ (cf. Dahl, 2000:319) but identical with that
Paraphrases with ‘to take’ occurred in East Slavic, including early Middle
Russian, in parallel use with other inceptive prefixed verbs with *
*čati* ‘to begin’,
although in standard Russian one finds today only one periphrastic future of
the type *budu* + imperfective infinitive. In Ukrainian, de-inceptive paraphrases
with the auxiliary *jati* ‘to take’ have been used, from the 14th century onward,
concurrently with the future tense composed of the auxiliary ‘to be’ and an
infinitive or an *l*-form (Danylenko, 2011b:174-177).

The structural isomorphism between the Hungarian and Ukrainian de-
inceptive futures has been largely neglected by the proponents of the CE
Sprachbund. Yet it has been discussed by some advocates of SAE (e.g., Dahl,
2000:319) as analogous of the ‘more famous’ Romance inflectional future,
derived from the Latin obligatory construction with the auxiliary *habere* ‘to
have’. Andersen (2006b:33-34) assumed that the typological parallelism
between the Hungarian and Ukrainian de-inceptive futures was more than a
coincidence. He reminded that the Hungarians settled among the Pannonian
Slavs in their current territory beginning around 900. Given the fact that
Hungarian is spoken on a now lost Slavic substratum and for a thousand years
has been surrounded by Slavic languages, it would be reasonable, as Andersen
argues, to guess that not only its system of aspects but also its choice of auxil-
ary for the imperfective future reflects the effects of centuries of Hungarian-

As all contact-related hypotheses of areal diffusion, Andersen’s explanation
is open to doubt (Danylenko, 2011b:168-171).10 Should we accept it, the

---

10 ‘The case of Vlach Romani, which uses the auxiliary ‘to take’, remains unclear. According to
Boretzky (1989:369), speakers of this language might have picked up the local de-inceptive
whole conception of CE with the ingressive (de-inceptive) future as its salient property is likely to collapse. If Hungarian calqued or replicated its ingressive future on the East Slavic de-inceptive tense formation, one is left with two options. First, in order to reconcile the obvious isomorphism between the Hungarian and Ukrainian periphrastic ingressive futures, one should include Ukrainian in the CE Sprachbund; however, this will infringe on the principle of prolonged language contact advocated by Thomas since the corresponding Ukrainian dialects have never been in contact with any CE language. Second, if the similarity between the Ukrainian and Hungarian use of the verb ‘to take’ for the periphrastic future is the result of independent, parallel changes, Hungarian should be excluded from CE where the original ingressive semantics is allegedly rendered with the help of other auxiliaries, ‘to be’ in Slavic and ‘to become’ in German (Kurzová, 1996a:5).

In terms of areal approach, the two options are difficult to choose from inasmuch as they are mutually exclusive.

6. Conclusions

The foregoing analysis demonstrated that the idea of areal relationship among the CE languages, as propounded by some scholars, is flawed. Commonly identified as marginal, Ukrainian and other Eastern Slavic languages serve in this case as a compelling illustration of the inadequacy of the ‘circumstantialist’ areal approach toward similar properties in the adjacent languages spoken not only in Central Europe (CE) but also in the whole of Europe as a linguistic area (SAE). The grouping within SAE is at best, as was emphasized, biased in favor of the languages of Europe’s western half, conceived of in terms of the geo-political priority rather than of the ‘linguistic vantage point’. An analogous bias is characteristic of the CE grouping where the priority is given to the ‘Habsburg’ languages (Thomas, 2008; Newerklà, 2002). Yet the principle deficiency of the areal profiling of European languages lies in its descriptive statistical approach devoid of genealogical and typological insights. However, if applied together with the areal parameters, the genealogical and typological analysis is capable of reversing the linguistic taxonomy of Europe, based on ‘extralinguistic’ generalizations rather than linguistic explication.
The foundation for such a synthetic (‘triple’) approach is traced to Meillet’s interpretation of Slavic as the most faithful to the ‘archaic grammatical type’ of IE (see section 5.2), which inevitably brings about a change in the ‘areal orientation’ of languages of Europe. Thus, typologically ‘conservative’ synthetic East Slavic, primarily Russian, having fully elaborated on prehistoric aspectual distinctions, might be placed at the ‘center’ of Europe as a linguistic area. Hence the existence of SAIE, with Russian serving as its focus language and (Southwest) Ukrainian holding the intermediate position between Russian and the rest of the languages of Europe. The distance between Ukrainian and different languages (or their groupings) in Europe differ in each individual case and is determined in typological rather than areal (diffusional) terms. It should be noted that Ukrainian as an intermediate language does not function as a transmitter of some properties from Russian to other languages of Europe or the other way round. Ukrainian tends to demonstrate such properties whose configuration places it typologically and areally between Russian and other languages of Europe.

At the periphery of SAIE, one finds typologically innovative, analytic Western European (primarily Germanic and Romance) languages, which elaborated, instead, on tense paradigms tending to get rid of the older aspectual distinctions inherited from the IE times. As a result, a more explicit (analytic) morphosyntactic marking, favored in prolonged contact situations (Lindstedt 2000:241) was ushered. Switching centers within linguistic Europe is not contingent on ‘accident’, inheritance, or diffusion (Thomason, 2000:313), but rather is premised on a synthesis of areal, genealogical, and typological parameters (Mel’nikov, 2003). This synthesis can account for developmental tendencies peeking out from the historic changes in individual languages due, in some cases, to contacts between languages belonging to different IE branches or different linguistic types and families such as the agglutinative one for Hungarian and the inflective one for Ukrainian (with primary synthetic features) or French (with secondary analytic features) (Danylenko, 2003:389-414; cf. Skalička, 1968).

It is not therefore surprising that, from the geo-political point of view, Ukrainian has been ‘banned’ from CE, which is largely premised on the 1772 Habsburg boundaries. The fact that Ukrainian and in some cases other Northern Slavic languages (dialects) share salient properties of the CE Sprachbund has not been seriously addressed thus far, although the structural parallelism between Ukrainian and CE, especially Czech and Slovak, is more than obvious and warrants revision in terms of the synthetic, ‘triple’ approach. Major parallel phonological and morphosyntactic features, commonly treated as CE-salient, are presented in Table 3; some of them have dialectal or functional restriction marked parenthetically:
The synopsis of the CE-salient features, shared by Ukrainian and some other Northern Slavic languages, raises several questions, which ought to be addressed in future research (cf. Heine and Kuteva, 2006:28). Here come some of them:

• Is there really a linguistic grouping within Central Europe?
• To what extent can the shared properties be products of the contact among the neighboring languages?
• What is the ratio of areal, genetic, and typological generalizations in determining linguistic groupings in (Central) Europe?
• What are the mechanisms behind the divergent and convergent development of the neighboring languages?
• What brought about the appearance of SAIE with its core morphosyntactic features found in Russian, North and Southeast (Modern) Ukrainian and some Belarusian dialects?
• What is the typological and areal distance between Ukrainian and different languages or their groupings in Europe?

The case of Ukrainian in its relation to CE and, more broadly, to SAE shows that, to claim that languages can undergo structural changes as a result of contact looks barely enough to explain why particular languages, not
necessarily adjacent, show convergent patterns. Suffice it to mention in this respect German and Southeast Ukrainian, which both have the medial l. In the case of CE-Ukrainian convergences, the contact-oriented theory becomes murkier, especially if one takes into consideration the phonological conservatism of East Slavic (Kalnyn’, 2008:15). Looking for the forces leading to the areal relationship in Europe, Heine and Kuteva (2006:49) speak about grammatical replication, a process whereby a language, called the replica language, creates a new grammatical structure on the model of some structure of another language, called the model language. What is not clear in this process is why and how replication involves particular structures, a question which is profitable to ask (Trudgill 1997:349).

The palliative solution might be sought in societal factors of linguistic patterning, which are likely to account for interrelated and concomitant changes at different levels of the language system (Plank, 1998:224). To name major factors, they are (1) amounts of adult language contact, (2) high or low social stability, (3) size of a speech community, (4) types of social networks, and (5) amounts of commonly shared information (Trudgill, 2011:146-184; cf. Mel’nikov, 2003:89-141). But how they may be applied in the study of linguistic groupings, including SAE, CE, and SAIE, is a topic for future research on Europe as a linguistic area.
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